

fight communism with common sense

"All the News
Kept Out of Print"

The Nation's Anti-Communist Newspaper

Common Sense



VOL. III, No. 88

Entered as Second Class Matter,
Post Office, Union, New Jersey, U.S.A.

UNION, NEW JERSEY, U.S.A., NOVEMBER 14, 1948

Published by Common Sense
Union, New Jersey, U.S.A.

FIVE CENTS EVERYWHERE

The Recognition of Israel

What Happened

(By Merwin K. Hart, President of National Economic Council, Inc., in Letter No. 203)

Council Letter 193 (June 15, 1948) was addressed to the delegates to the Republican National Convention. It said among other things:

"In 1936, in 1940, and again in 1944, the Republican Party . . . vainly imagined it could defeat New Deal philosophy by itself adopting the same line. . . .

"The opportunity for change is here, now. It has come before, but it may not come again. In 1940 and 1944, the Republican Party merely aped the New Deal, assuring the people that it could 'do the job better.' Defeat in those years was deserved, for the people were denied a choice between a party that stood for ultimate serfdom and one that stood for freedom.

"Victory in November . . . is by no means sure. With a fumbling, 'me-too' platform and a fumbling, 'me-too' candidate, the Republican Party could meet a final and crushing defeat. . . .

"The question today is whether, in the coming campaign, the same mistakes are to be repeated."

Asking the delegates to give the American people "a real leader and a real issue in November, 1948," the Letter declared:

"If the delegates fail in this, then, from the standpoint of America, they might as well not meet."

Same Fatal Errors Repeated

But both the party leaders and their candidates for President repeated the mistakes of 1940 and 1944. And not only the candidate met the crushing defeat we predicted in June, but in BOTH houses of Congress the party was defeated also.

And defeat came for just one reason: For the third time in twelve years the left-wing self-styled "liberal" element infiltrated the Republican Party and guided its course and that of its candidates for President.

What happened at the polls November 2 was the inevitable result of the campaigns of Mr. Truman and Mr. Dewey.

Mr. Truman had a forlorn case, but he worked night and day. We think at times he was unjust and ill-advised in what he said and did. But his campaign was positive and carried conviction.

Mr. Dewey's campaign rang with insincerity from first to last.

The great question before the American people was—and still is—whether we are going Socialist, and eventually Communist, or are to return to the American system of private enterprise, private property and individual initiative.

The people voted on this question in the fall of 1946, and elected a Congress with a mandate to turn against the New Deal. The Congress, continuously under the barrage of skilful, often dishonest, left-wing propaganda, responded only partially to the mandate. The great question was to come before the people in the fall of 1948.

One thing Mr. Dewey said often during the campaign was true that the American people were ready for a change. God knows, that was true. Yet he offered them no change in policy and so failed utterly to give them reason to vote a change in personnel.

Long before Election Day Mr. Dewey had made it clear that, if elected, the Republican Party would continue the New Deal—would even broaden it. For Mr. Dewey advocated measures that even the Roosevelt New Deal had not put through.

We have a two-party system in the United States

THE AMERICAN WAY



Released by George Peck Associates

—one of the chief reasons for the astounding success of the American Republic. In the nature of things one of these parties is more conservative, the other less so. Our greatest success in the past has in large part come from permitting neither party to remain in power too long. After a certain amount of conservatism we need a change; after some years of less conservatism we need a change again.

One reason the betting was fifteen to one on Dewey was the conviction that the Democrats had over-stayed their time. Never did a candidate for President have a better chance of being elected. All that was demanded of him was that he have a constructive, conservative program—and that he fight for it.

But Mr. Dewey would not fight. He betrayed not only his party, but his country. He did practically nothing but smile and utter generalities. While Mr. Truman was fighting vigorously for the radical program of his party, Mr. Dewey was contenting himself with telling people how much of that program he was for.

Mr. Dewey, an able man in many ways, had only to take the lead of the millions in the country who wished to return to the American system. He failed them utterly. He promised an unraveling of red-tape; yet he endorsed steps that would have multiplied it. He took his cue from the tradition—not of the Republican Party and of the Republic, but of Socialism. He led his party to the greatest disaster it has suffered in the 92 years of its history. It was not so much a Truman victory as a Dewey defeat.

"Religion is the enemy of Communism. We must do our utmost to emphasize that religious survivals in our country play a reactionary, harmful role. They are hostile to that great cause toward which the toilers are laboring under the leadership of the Communist Party." — Soviet Byelorussian, official organ of the Byelorussian Republic, Sept. 27, 1948.

GOOD FAITH OF GREAT BRITAIN QUESTIONED IN REVIEW OF UNPRECEDENTED ACTION BY UNITED STATES RESULTING FROM YIELDING OF PRINCIPLES AT YALTA.

By REV. JAMES M. GILLIS, C.S.P.

(The zeal of a modern crusader in attacking political corruption and moral indifference gives Rev. James Martin Gillis, C.S.P., a foremost place in our modern Catholic world. An acclaimed editor, preacher, lecturer and radio speaker and writer, Father Gillis has many points of vantage from which to launch his attack on the evils of today and to present the Christian answer to the world's ills.

Father Gillis is the author of many books, including "False Prophets" (1925), "The Ten Commandments" (1931) and "Christianity and Civilization" (1932). He was a valued contributor to the Catholic Encyclopedia. He is a member of the Catholic Press Association, the Interracial Council, and the Academy of Living Catholic Authors.)

The unseemly haste with which our Department of State officially acknowledged the "Republic" of Israel shows that once we have gone in for international meddling, we shall play the game as all others have done with cold-blooded disregard of ethical principle. Ethical? We didn't even follow political principle. It has hitherto been customary for nations to wait and see which party in a civil war wins and establishes an apparently stable regime. We didn't wait. We rushed incontinently into a dispute that was still raging, that was in fact just beginning.

UNHOLY SPEED

Arthur Krock, distinguishing between a *de facto* and a *de jure* government in The New York Times for May 20th, says, "Jefferson, as Secretary of State, instructed Gouverneur Morris, the American Minister at Paris (Nov. 7, 1792), that 'it accords with our principles to acknowledge any government to be rightful which is formed by the will of the nation, substantially declared.'"

Mr. Truman gave no reason for thinking that the will of "the nation" had been substantially declared. He could not have done so because it was obviously not true. Mr. Krock interprets Jefferson: "The regime is accepted by the inhabitants of the area and there is no evidence that this regime cannot take care of its immediate obligations." Neither of those two requisites was in evidence when the President acted.

Furthermore we gave not even lip service to the United Nations. We who had been the prime movers, and in effect the sole support of that organization, gave it the coup de grace, making no slightest gesture of regret. We weren't even polite to our guests on the Flushing Flats. Indeed we had kept our own chief representative guessing as to what we were about to do. Like a tumbler on the stage, we turned a back somersault from left to right, another from right to left, a third from left to right again with bewildering speed. We were for partition, against partition, for partition. We had Warren Austin so dizzy that he threatened to resign. We persuaded him to stand by, and while he and all the other delegates looked on in dumb amazement we declared the birth of Israel before it was well out of the womb. Our haste was not only unseemly; it was indecent. What Stalin had done in Czechoslovakia we did in Palestine. We had blamed him for interference in the internal affairs of another nation, but when our turn came for trickery, we proved ourselves quicker and slicker than the master criminal.

COUP DE GRACE

From now on no American with a conscience and a memory can say that we entered international politics with the purpose of purifying it. The opinion of Nathaniel Peffer quoted in these pages two months ago that any claim on the part of the United States to be a moral leader of the nations would be hypocritical, has been justified. The cynical statement, also mentioned and repudiated in the same issue of this magazine, that

"no nation has an ethical ideal" has been verified. We, the only nation remaining that had or seemed to have some claim to be different, have written ourselves down as just like the rest of them. We have touched pitch and we have been defiled. From now on the hope or the belief that America represents an ideal will sound silly.

NEW OR GENTILE, NO DIFFERENCE

Some will read into these reluctant indignant sentences evidence that I am anti-Jewish. They may think what they will and say what they please. When the accusations come in, as they surely will, I shall not bother to acknowledge, not to say answer them. But I will condescend so far as to explain here and now once and for all that if my country had acted with the same reckless disregard for ethics in regard to Greece or Turkey or China or Korea or Liberia or Liechtenstein, I would have expressed my disappointment and disgust in equally vigorous phrases. It is a matter of no importance to me that Jews and Arabs happened to be the occasion of the shame of my country. If it had been Hungarians and Rumanians, or Hot-tentots and Senegalese, my reaction would be exactly the same. All that concerns me in this moment of disillusion is that the ideal of America as not only politically and historically but morally different from the kingdoms and empires which for thousands of years have cursed the earth with their villainies—that ideal is gone. I might have known it when we dropped the atom bomb on helpless Japanese peasants in their homes and in the fields of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Even a military man—Hanson Baldwin—had sense to see that at that moment we fell from our pedestal. He saw it and he said it. I also saw it and said it (see *The Catholic World* for September, 1945) but I still hoped that what we had done at Hiroshima and Nagasaki might have been a solitary blunder. Now I see that we are deliberately embarked upon a course of political crime. From now on we shall emulate Britain, France, Spain, Metternich, Talleyrand, Machiavelli. We have abandoned our 150 year old tradition of political isolation. We have committed ourselves to intervention, and with intervention we have accepted the methods of all previous interventionists. What Woodrow Wilson said of the countries of Europe, "They are all tarred with the same stick," can never be said again by a President of the United States unless the pot may call the kettle black.

The judicious reader may say that this outburst of aname and wrath is too violent to have been caused by the one episode of our precipitate recognition of a state as existing before it did in fact exist. That reader will be right. My fears for our moral integrity have been rising ever since we went into the second world war. Someone has said, "we were lied into that war." So we were. If the question had been asked immediately after Pearl Harbor, "Who hath sinned, this people or its President?" the answer would have been "not the people but the President." He was in bad faith, we were in good faith. But now the people have compounded the crime with their government. The government has done a dastardly thing and the people have remained silent.

"WHAT A FALL WAS THERE!"

In *The Catholic World*, we have cried out against this sort of thing incessantly for the last nine years. Fear and hope alternated within us. Now there is neither fear nor hope but conviction: America has taken its stand with the other nations of the world, as cynical, unscrupulous, contemptuous of ethics. The Palestine episode was the solvent dropped into a murky solution, making it perfectly clear.

Last month I quoted Vergil who, speaking of Troy, said *Fuit Ilium*, adapting his phrase to fit England, *Fuit Britannia*. Britain was and is no more. If some gloating Britisher now retorts, *Fuit America*, America has ceased to exist—that is to say America has ceased to be what it was created to be—we can only cry *teuho!* America will continue for some years, perhaps for some centuries, as a geographical and political entity. As an ideal it is done for.

If there seems to be a too complete finality about that statement, let us qualify it. America as an ideal is finished unless America is converted, does penance, suffers, makes reparation and so regains divine grace. In the Old Testament God spoke by the mouth of the prophets to His people, threatening that He would cast them off unless they obeyed His commandments. He indicated that a nation, like an individual could lose its soul, and by the same sins. However, "still stands Thine ancient sacrifice, and humble and a contrite heart." Can America as a nation become contrite? Yes, if she first be humbled. Shall we say God forbid that she be humbled? Say not God forbid, say rather

BY LENIN —

"A Communist must be prepared to make every sacrifice and, if necessary, to resort to all sorts of schemes and stratagems, employ illegitimate methods, conceal the truth."

if it please God to humble us and so save us, His will be done.

SILENCE WILL BE BETTER

I have said above that Britain may now, if she will, gloat over our defection from the thin ranks of those nations that have not been defiled by international sin. But if the British are wise they will refrain from any such cynical exultation. For many centuries the English have been committing the crimes that we Americans have only of late learned to imitate. Against the American Colonists, and India, and Egypt and China—to say nothing of Ireland—Britain has offended. As for what she has done in Palestine in the twenty-six years that have elapsed since she accepted the mandate, only the brief statement need be made that she went in, accomplished little, made a sorry mess of things, pulled out and left chaos behind her. The *Encyclopedia Britannica* publication, *Ten Eventful Years*, says "Britain and the United States (Britain of necessity; we by choice) embroiled themselves more and more hopelessly in the complexities of the case" of Palestine. Britain, not so bereft of common sense as of honor, pulled out. We with neither common sense nor honor, plunged in. Britain with centuries of experience in imperialism, confesses defeat. Do we, raw neophytes at the game, expect success after the experts have confessed failure? What lunacy is this that has come upon us since we ventured into that—to us—terra incognita, internationalism?

Whatever be the strictly legal or logical deduction from the Balfour Declaration and the McMahon Resolution, those two documents were so craftily worded as to deceive both Jews and Arabs. As a matter of fact even in one document, the earlier of the two, may be found the double talk responsible for the present crisis.

The Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917, five weeks before the entry of Lord Allenby into Jerusalem reads: "His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of that object, it being understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by the Jews in any other country." A typically shrewd diplomatic document. It seems to say something but on close scrutiny is found to say nothing.

INDIAN GIVER

What it appears to give with the right hand it takes away with the left. "A national home for the Jewish people" is a pretentious phrase if the Jews were to live in the house of the Arabs. If on the other hand the Arabs were to surrender part of their own home or even share their own home with the Jews, how was that arrangement to be managed without prejudice to the civil rights of the Arabs? The Jews interpreted the Declaration to mean that they were to possess Palestine "as the English possess England and the French possess France." The Arabs interpreted the Declaration to mean that the Jews were to be guests in the Arabs' house. Why don't the British and all other adepts write diplomatic documents in unambiguous language? The obvious answer is that diplomatic documents are meant to be ambiguous. Diplomats dispose of the problem at the moment, leaving the consequences to the next generation. We are the next generation.

Further to confuse confusion, Winston Churchill, Colonial Secretary in 1920, a year and a half after the end of the First War, issued a White Paper, explaining, says the *Britannica*, that Britain had no intention of creating a wholly Jewish Palestine or of contemplating the disappearance or subordination of the Arab population. Yet in the White Paper we read that "the Jewish population is to be in Palestine as of right, and not on sufferance," and that "the Jewish national home should be internationally guaranteed."

DIPLOMATIC MAGIC

It is doubtful if the Delphic Oracle ever did a better job of illumination-obfuscation than the Balfour Declaration, explained by the Churchill White Paper. Such is diplomatic verbiage. The diplomats could write simply and plainly if they would. It is because they won't say what they mean that we have wars. And now, we the United States of America are to join their company and play with them the international game of double talk and double cross.

I hasten to confess that we, or rather our late President, in our name but without our knowledge had already indulged in that tricky game. Not all that he told Ibn Saud in their conversation on shipboard in the Mediterranean has leaked out. Some day the as yet unrevealed parts of it may rise and smack us in the face. The usual guess is that Mr. Roosevelt promised the Arab leader that the United States would do nothing to the disadvantage of the Arab Union. Mr. Truman does nothing to the disadvantage of the Arabs except tumble over himself in clumsy haste to take sides against them in their war with the Jews!

HAVE WE FORGOTTEN OUR PAST?

The cheapest and meanest thing we have done in connection with the Palestine incident is our rebuke to the Lebanese Government, which had interrupted the progress of forty American Jews on their way to fight in Palestine. What else could Lebanon do? Neutral or belligerent it was her right and her duty not to let recruits for Haganah pass through her territory. When our own Civil War was in progress we not only halted but we fired upon English ships running the blockade into the Confederacy. But now we have bullied little Lebanon for doing what international law permits or even commands her to do! Worse still we lied about our motive: "there shall be no discrimination against bearers of American passports on the ground of race, color or creed!"

The hypocrisy is nauseating. Lebanon didn't stop those American Jews because they were Jews but because they were potential and intentional militants. As for "color," why was that word lugged in? There are, I know, a few Jewish Negroes in the world, but were any of the forty blockade running recruits for Zion of that rare breed? The British may be right when they allege that the purpose of Mr. Truman's breakneck speed in recognizing the Jewish State was to hold the Jewish vote for November elections. But did the Democratic National Committee see a chance of snaring some Negro votes by inserting the "color" into our communique to Lebanon? "Oh, what a tangled web we weave, When first we practice to deceive!" There should be someone in the Senate or the House at Washington to arise and cry shame. There seems to be no one.

Of all men in either of the houses of Congress, Robert Taft has seemed to be the most likely candidate for statesmanship if not for the Presidency. But his moral judgment seems to have been affected by the hysteria in the atmosphere of Madison Square Garden filled with 19,000 Zionists or Zionist sympathizers and some 75,000 more listening on the outside. So he plumped for the Jewish State as swiftly and as absolutely as President Truman and the Department of State. He demanded the lifting of the embargo against the sale of Arms to "the middle East." By the "middle East" he meant, of course, the new Jewish State. The Arabs were already being supplied with arms and ammunition, perhaps also with military advice if not military personnel, by Britain. The Ukrainian delegate to the United Nations, declared in a forty minute tirade that "the armed forces of Trans-Jordan are in reality armed forces of the United Kingdom." The Ukraine being a Soviet satellite, its delegate, Vassili Tarasenko, probably lied. But the lie was not made out of the whole cloth.

SEEING IT THROUGH

When he spoke, the British were arming the Arabs. To say nothing of the anomaly of the United States arming one side while Britain was arming the other, it may be asked if Mr. Taft realized fully the consequences of what he was recommending. To favor one side in a civil war is to take part in that war. Might not Mr. Taft have waited to ask the American people as a whole, or at least Congress, or the United Nations, whether our people, our Congress, our creature the U.N. would recommend our going to war?

Mr. Gallup's poll has seemingly shown that 65% of the American people have abandoned isolation. But did Mr. Gallup's agents when taking that poll (in the middle of May) explain that intervention, the only real alternate to isolation, means war? As far as I have seen in the newspapers, no one, from President Truman and Senator Taft all the way down the line to Mr. Gallup's hired men, has put the question plainly to the people: "Do you favor going to war to establish the Jewish State? Do you still favor going to war if we must wage war with the Pan-Arab League of 250 million people? And if that war evolves into a war with Russia and thence becomes a third World War?" I could wish that Mr. Taft or Mr. Truman (I wouldn't bother overmuch with Mr. Gallup) would answer those questions.

If the answer is that we should be willing to plunge the world into war a third time to provide the Jews a home in Palestine, the way would then be open to the inevitable question, "So you think it the vocation of America not merely to arbitrate or legislate as one member of a world assembly, not merely to send food and money to a homeless people, but to go to their rescue with all the military might at our disposal, come what may, even though what comes be a world war?"

R. S. V. P.

I have been asking these questions for years. Not any man in the government, high or low, so much as condescends to notice the questions not to say answer them. I am sending them to all the candidates for the Presidency as well as to a selected list of Senators and congressmen. I will report here on their answers, if any.

Why this sudden spurt of righteousness when a home for the Jews is in question? We didn't turn a hand, we only raised an eyebrow when Poland was enslaved. Czechoslovakia was our state; we created it, or at least we assembled it from previously existing parts. But

when the Soviet took it over we sat by and did no more than issue lamentations.

IF ONE, WHY NOT THE OTHERS?

At the time these words are being put on paper the rumor is that Hungary is to come next in the Soviet plan of absorption. Will we wage war—will we risk precipitating a world war to save Hungary? And Greece? And Turkey? And Korea? A politician, in my book at least, is one who says we shall have whom we wish to save, we shall surrender the others to tyranny. A statesman, a philanthropist, a humanitarian, on the other hand is one who sees that if we make it our foreign policy to rescue distressed people from tyrants and to provide a homeland for the displaced, we must go through with it. If, at the risk of war, perhaps a "Holy War" with the Arabs, or even a world war, we make a home for the Jews, we must take up in order the cause of all other displaced persons. Eighty per cent of them are non-Jewish. Them also must we save from their sad plight of wandering over the face of the earth.

KEEP THE MOTIVE CLEAN

We must find a homeland not only for Jews but for Christians. If to do so means to crowd them into a land where they are not welcome, it will be too bad but it must be done. We have created a home for the wandering Jew; now let us create four other homes for the four times as many wandering non-Jews. Let us do it even if we have to turn the whole world upside down, or set it ablaze again with universal war. If we discriminate between Jew and non-Jew it will be alleged that we act not from humanity but from some ulterior motive; even that we are impelled by the base motive of partisan politics. Already there are those who say we rushed to help the Jews because of the Jewish vote in New York, Chicago, Boston. We cannot let that suspicion go unchallenged. We must complete our plan of rescuing all who suffer.

Will the Zionists themselves be as generous about finding a homeland for all other wanderers as they were about finding a home for themselves? We shall wait and watch and listen for word from Chaim Weizmann, President Truman, Senator Taft, Mayor O'Dwyer and the others who expressed themselves so eloquently on and about the 15th of May. Will they love humanity in December (after election) as they did in May (before election)? We shall see.

THE END SUPPOSES THE MEANS

I should like to remind all who fancy themselves as statesmen and not mere politicians, of the maxim they must have learned in logic, "Qui vult finem vult et media," "he who wills to achieve a certain end must be understood to wish also the means to that end." If I will go to California—not wish but will—I must will also the means of getting to California. I can do it in ten hours by plane. If a plane is not available I must take the slow-poke method of going by train. If I can afford neither plane nor train I must go by bus. If I haven't the wherewithal for the bus I must thumb my way. If the laws of all the states across the continent are against hitchhikers, I must hoof it to California.

If we really mean that it is the duty of the U. S. A. to right all wrongs in the world and to rescue all afflicted peoples, we must persuade the U.N. to attend to that little matter. If the U.N. declines to act, we must ask Britain to co-operate with us. If Britain excuses herself, we must ask the "Western Union" of Europe. Since the Western Union is as yet unborn—except in desire—we must do what we can with propaganda. Propaganda failing we must make gifts of food and money. If food and money don't turn the trick, we must try arms in the hands of others. If arms in the hands of others are insufficient we must go to war ourselves to establish a home for the Jews in Palestine or to do any other task that we think humanitarian. Do Mr. Gallup's pollsters follow through like that? Does Mr. Taft see the end in the beginning? If not, is he a statesman?

One immediate result of our over-hasty acknowledgement of Israel as a de facto government (of course it was not de facto when we said it was) is our apparent break with Britain. At the moment when the politicians were waving their arms and shouting wildly to frenzied crowds that we must lift the embargo on arms to Israel, Britain was shipping arms to the Arabs and declaring that she had no intention of ceasing to do so unless and until the U.N. should declare the Arabs aggressors. Be it remarked in passing that if the U.N. does so declare, it may change the political picture, but it will not alter the truth. But who cares for truth?

AMERICA AND BRITAIN AT ODDS?

Meanwhile the scandalous spectacle is presented to the world of Britain arming one belligerent and America arming the other while Russia looks on and rejoices. Some professional observers of the British opposition to the U.S.A. explain that it is not genuine. It has, they say, a diplomatic purpose. Britain will turn against the Arabs if she must, at as late a date as possible,

hoping for Arab victories and consequent Arab territorial aggrandisement.

When the time comes—so runs the explanation—Britain will suggest that Abdullah in Trans-Jordan and Farouk in Egypt be permitted to hold what they have taken, but that they then desist. Nice game! Nice people!

It may be a surmise or a guess, but no one can deny that such things are done in the name of diplomacy. I wonder whether the American people will enjoy playing that kind of game from now on. Like it or lump it, that's the sort of thing our government must do if it is to hold its own with the governments that have been doing it for hundreds of years if you reckon with Egypt and Syria. Henceforth it will not be a question of what is right or wrong, but of what is expedient or inexpedient.

AT LAST, REALPOLITIK

Like all other nations, now that we have entered into competition with them, we shall do what seems most practical. Now at last we are in the game of REAL-POLITICK. We took the plunge at Yalta. At least our President did. Now, with silence which means acquiescence in the matter of Palestine we have all taken a dive into the pool of pitch which is international trickery.

However it may be that Britain is not fooling but "playing it straight." Once in a while there is a rift in the pea-soup fog of British diplomacy, and we catch a glimpse of what the British would do if we stupid American blunderers were suddenly to find ourselves embroiled in a "Holy War" with the vast Arab Union. Such a rift in the murk were those words of the London Economist, "Not many people in Great Britain believe that it is the deliberate and conscious aim of American policy to ruin Britain and all that Britain stands for in the world. But the evidence can be read that way." (Emphasis added.)

They are not sure of us, and if they are not sure of us, how can we be sure of them? There may or may not be many in America who believe that Britain would deliberately and consciously double-cross America, but the evidence that she deceived first the Jews and then the Arabs could be read as indicating that she might run out on us if we get caught in a trap between the Jews and the Arabs. Yes indeed, nice game, nice people, but if a tenderfoot sits in at poker with "tough hombres" who follow the custom of having an ace up their sleeve, and a knife in their boot, what can the simpleton expect? As the Tipperary stone throwers said when an intruder from Dublin or Cork got a hole in his head, "what business had the thin-skulled fool in a Tipperary street while we were indulging in our local pastime?" If only poor foolish Uncle Sam would come home when they clean him out or crack his head open! But that would be "isolationism", and as Mr. Gallup informs us, 65% of the American people reprobate isolationism.

ONE DIE-HARD AMERICAN

Now let's have this perfectly plain: if at any time in the future Britain considers it to her advantage to side with or even to fight with the Arabs, while we side with and fight with the Jews, she will do what seems to be to her advantage. No nation acts in accordance with an ethical ideal. And since Scripture says, "With the good thou shalt be good and with the wicked thou shalt be wicked," we shall have to chuck our own ethical ideal, if we ever had one, now that we are no longer bush-leaguers but are in the big time of international diplomacy.

I was brought up to believe that the United States of America meant something not only in the moral but the spiritual sphere, that it was, in a kind of way an embodiment of Christian principles (had we not borrowed from St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Robert Bellarmine the essential phrases of the Declaration of Independence?), but now I begin to fear that my early faith was childish. I can hear the sophisticates say, "Grow up, be a man, leave legends and myths and superstitions in the nursery where they belong. At the latest you should have dropped them when you put adolescence behind and donned the toga virilis. The United States of America is only one more government, just like the rest. Why don't you accept it as such?" But still in my obstinacy I say "God forbid!" (Reprinted with permission from The Catholic World)

The Communist sees capitalism ending in misery and violence. As Marx wrote to Kugelmann (April 12, 1871), the Communists don't want to take over the State machine "but to smash it." Lenin (Selected Works, vol. 2, p. 37.) laid down that the preliminary condition for a real people's revolution in England is "the smashing, the destruction of the ready-made State machine". In case there should be any doubt about it, Stalin ("Leninism", p. 35.) repeated that "the smashing of the bourgeois State machine as a preliminary condition for such a revolution is an inevitable law of the revolutionary movement."

POTSDAM HELPED FOSTER WAR

World War II is now supposed to have been over for about three years, but there is no peace. FDR got in with the wrong bedfellows—Stalin, Molotov and other liquidators. What a different world it would have been if we had had a statesman rather than an ailing fourth term President in the White House. What a difference there would have been if we had had a President who would have surrounded himself with men of wisdom, rather than with pinks, reds, nondescripts, Morgenthau and Whites.

Then there would have been no "unconditional surrender." The world is now paying dearly for those cruel and brutal words. Russia would still be within her own boundaries. There would have been a disarmament, in place of an armament race. Several million people that are no more would still be alive. There would have been a just and lasting peace.

Germany and her satellites would have accepted any terms and conditions we asked for. They were vanquished. They would have agreed to a complete disarmament and all reasonable reparations.

However, in place of that our Commander-in-Chief halted our army for some eight weeks in order to permit the Russian liquidators to take over the Balkan States, and then march into Berlin. What a headache those blunders are to us and the world. Whatever price we and the world may have to pay in lives, limbs, health or wealth in dealing with Stalin will be the direct result of the blunders made by FDR at Teheran and Yalta, and by Truman at Potsdam.

Again, we now know that Senator Bridges was correct when he said that the Japanese were ready to surrender in the preceding January. The former President branded this as a falsehood, but time has proven that the Senator was correct, and the falsehood was at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

The Japanese were vanquished. They too would have accepted any terms or conditions we asked for. Unfortunately, instead there was a refusal to even consider unconditional surrender until our former President gave the Kuril Islands and half of Korea to Stalin.

Worse still we are now threatened with World War III. It is a fifty-fifty proposition. The sooner we call Stalin's bluff the better for us. The more time we give him, the more dangerous he will become. We have already been too long in bad company. The quicker we get out of it the better for us and the world. Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam were sad days for America and for all the world.

OFFICIAL SOVIET GOVERNMENT STATEMENT

"The work of Communist organization in foreign countries is regulated as follows: In the military sphere.

(a) Carry on intensive propaganda among the troops. Cause misunderstandings between officers and soldiers. Incite the soldiers to assassination of the higher officers.

(b) Blow up arsenals, bridges, tracks, powder magazines. Prevent the delivery of supplies of raw materials to factories and mills. Thus the complete destruction of the army will be accomplished and the soldiers will adopt the program of the social democratic workers". (The Russian Soviet Regime, Doc. No. 3 of the Soviet Committee of the Soviet Government of Russia, p. 296.)

Three years ago, while Earl Browder was head of the Communist Party in the U. S., he stated there were 33,000 Communists in our Army.

TO BE A COMMUNIST —OR NOT TO BE
A COMMUNIST?

THAT IS THE QUESTION.

TO BE A COMMUNIST IS NOT TO BE
AN AMERICAN!

THAT IS THE ANSWER.

Negro Editor Critical of Civil-Rights

There is an appalling lack of understanding of racial issue as it involves the Negro race in the United States due to Communist distortion of the problems entailed. For this reason Common Sense republishes an article from the November issue of Destiny Magazine, quoting David Lee, a Negro publisher whose newspaper, "The Telegraph", of Newark, N. J., has a circulation of 500,000, and is well qualified to speak for the Negro. As a champion of his race, Mr. Lee assails the civil rights agitation and states:

"I have just returned from an extensive tour of the South. In addition to meeting and talking with our agent and distributors who get our newspapers out to more than 500,000 readers in the South, I met both Negroes and Whites in the urban and rural centers.

"Because of these personal observations, studies and contacts, I feel that I can speak with some degree of authority. I am certainly in a better position to voice an opinion than the Negro leader who occupies a suite in downtown New York and bases his opinions on the South from the distorted stories he reads in the Negro press and in The Daily Worker.

"The racial lines in the South are so clearly drawn and defined there can be no confusion. When I am in Virginia or South Carolina I don't wonder if I will be served if I walk into a White restaurant. I know the score. However, I have walked into several right here in New Jersey where we have a civil-rights law, and have been refused service.

"The Whites in the South stay with their own and the Negroes do likewise. This one fact has been the economic salvation of the Negro in the South. Atlanta, Georgia compares favorably with Newark in size and population. Negroes there own and control millions of dollars' worth of business. All of the Negro business in New Jersey will not amount to as much as our race has in one city in Georgia. This is also true in South Carolina and Virginia.

"New Jersey today boasts of more civil-rights legislation than any other state in the Union, and state government itself practices more discrimination than Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Ernest Collins, a young Negro, operates Negro in the motor vehicle department. All of the states mentioned employ plenty.

"No matter what a Negro wants to do, he can do it in the South. In Spartanburg, South Carolina Ernest Collins, a young Negro, operates a large funeral home; a taxicab business, a filling station, grocery store, has several busses, runs a large farm and a night club.

"Collins couldn't do all that in New Jersey or New York. The only bus line operated by Negroes is in the South. The Safe Bus Company

in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, owns and operates over a hundred. If a Negro in New Jersey or New York had the money and attempted to obtain a franchise to operate a line he not only would be turned down, but he would be lucky if he didn't get a bullet in the back.

"The attitude of the Southerners toward our race is a natural psychological reaction and aftermath of the Civil War. Negroes were the properties of these people.

"Certainly you could not expect the South to forget this in 75 or even a hundred and fifty years. That feeling has passed from one generation to another, but it is not one of hatred for the Negro. The South just doesn't believe that the Negro has grown up. No section of the country has made more progress in finding a workable solution to the Negro problem than the South. Naturally Southerners are resentful when the North attempts to ram a civil-rights program down their throats.

"The entire race program in America is wrong. We expend all our energies and spend millions of dollars trying to convince White people that we are as good as they are, but we are an equal. Joe Louis is not looked upon as a Negro but the greatest fighter of all time, loved and admired by Whites in South Carolina as much as by those in Michigan. He convinced the world, not by propaganda and agitation, but by demonstration.

"Our fight for recognition, justice, civil rights and equality should be carried on within the race. Let us demonstrate to the world by our living standards, our conduct, our ability and intelligence, that we are the equal of any man, and when we shall have done this the entire world, including the South, will accept us on our terms. Our present program of threats and agitation makes enemies out of our friends."

These remarks manifest the kind of understanding needed and reflect an attitude which, if shared by others, can engender a spirit of respect between races as each recognizes the problems of other races. As stated in a previous editorial in "Destiny", it is possible to live at peace and bring about good will between men of all races. But each race must develop equality of opportunity within its own racial bounds and its members secure for themselves the benefits that accrue to all men regardless of race or color under a system of free enterprise.

It is unfortunate that propaganda of a vicious character, originating in Moscow, has distorted the issues involved and engendered ill-will among the unthinking of both the White and Negro races. It would be well if all concerned would recognize the origin of these lying and evil innuendoes and move to immediately counteract their deadly purpose.

INFORMATIVE SUPPLEMENTAL READING

CONFESIONS OF STALIN'S AGENT . 50c
(Startling revelations by Kenneth Goff, a former Communist!)

FACTS ABOUT COMMUNISM 50c
By Edward Lodge Curran, Ph.D.

MICE OR MEN 50c
Underground Secret Police Terror exposed by Joseph Kamp.

THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE .. 35c
By Major Robert H. Williams, former Counter Intelligence Officer.

UNCOVERING THE FORCES OF WAR \$1.00
By Conrad K. Grieb. Read the history of these great betrayals of the American people and Constitutional Government.

TRAITORS 25c
By George W. Armstrong.

WORLD EMPIRE \$1.00
By George W. Armstrong.

THE ROOSEVELT MYTH \$3.50
By John T. Flynn. This volume brings together all the known and hitherto unknown facts about one of the most fantastic episodes in American political history.

INCREDIBLE INFAMY 30c
By A. O. Tittman. This pamphlet shows how the Morgenthau-Truman control policy for Germany is contributing to the slow starvation of the German people.

WHILE THEY FOUGHT \$3.00
By Helen Lombard. General Moseley says: "Read this book and act before it is too late. It is your duty to save the republic." Pub. by Chas. Scribner & Son.

RISE, AMERICA! \$2.00
By Peter L. Xavier. In his courageous book, Mr. Xavier unmasks the scheming and treacherous forces of Interventionism.

THE RED PRUSSIAN \$4.00
By S. Schwarzschild. The Life and Legend of Karl Marx.

THE PIXYLATED PROPHET 25c
By L. Ray Carroll. A pocket-sized, comprehensive analysis of Karl Marx.

All Postpaid. Order from

COMMON SENSE, UNION, N. J.

The Nation's Anti-Communist Newspaper
"All the News Kept Out of Print"

Common Sense

Union, New Jersey, U. S. A.

Please enter my subscription for **Common Sense** for
☐ Six months, \$1. ☐ One year, \$2. ☐ Two years, \$3.50

NAME PLEASE PRINT NAME DISTINCTLY

ADDRESS

CITY ZONE STATE

fight communism with common sense
Trade Mark Registered United States Patent Office.

HELP US TO HELP YOU!

Common Sense is a non-profit, non-sectarian, non-political enterprise engaged exclusively in the task of informing the American people of the dangers which threaten our Republic and the established institutions of our kind of civilization.

**TO WIN YOUR FIGHT FOR YOU WE
NEED VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS
FROM PUBLIC SPIRITED FRIENDS**

*If for business, professional, social or political considerations, or any other personal reason, it is more desirable to make your contribution anonymously, just pin a \$10. or \$5. or \$1. bill to this coupon and mail! It will be an added "straw" by which you help to "break the camel's back"!

OBEY THAT IMPULSE!

Trade Mark Registered United States Patent Office.

Common Sense

Union, New Jersey, U. S. A.

Conde McGinley

Editor

You can do your bit to help protect and preserve the precious heritage common to all good Americans by your help in distributing copies of **Common Sense** to individuals and organizations to the limit of your financial capacity and of your ability to cooperate.

QUANTITY	PRICE POSTPAID	QUANTITY	PRICE POSTPAID
3000	\$80.00	500	\$15.00
2000	55.00	100	3.00
1000	30.00	30	1.00

Special low prices for large quantities to churches, schools, veterans' groups, labor unions, and commercial, social and civic groups. Quotations upon application.

Published twice monthly at
2001 Pleasant Parkway, Union, New Jersey, U. S. A.

Trade Mark Registered United States Patent Office.

**THE FIRST DEFENSE AGAINST COMMUNISM IS TO UNDERSTAND IT! INFORM YOURSELF AND YOUR FRIENDS!
HELP STOP THE SPREAD OF COMMUNISM BY SUBSCRIBING TO COMMON SENSE AND DISTRIBUTING COPIES!**